Mr. Cliff Guffey
President

## Certified Mail Tracking Number:

 70102780000364763978American Postal Workers
Union, AFL-CIO
1300 L Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-4128
Dear Cliff,
As information, enclosed is a copy of the second and Final Post Implementation Review for the Frederick, MD Processing and Distribution Facility (P\&DF) Area Mail Processing (AMP).

If you have any questions, please contact Rickey Dean at extension 7412.
Sincerely,


Patrick M. Devine
Manager
Contract Administration (APWU)
Enclosure

1. Losing Facility Information
Type of Distribution Consolidated: Originating
Facillty Name \& Type: Frederick P\&DF
Street Address: 1550 Tilco Drive
City: FrederickState: MD
5D Facility ZIP Code: 21704
District: Batimore
Area: Capital Metro
Finance Number: 23-3355
Current 3D ZIP Code(s): ..... 217
Miles to Gaining Facility: ..... 28.7
EXFC office: Yes
Plant Manager: Bruce Wall
Senior Plant Manager. Gregory P. Incontro
District Manager: Wililim Ridenour
, Gaining Facility Information
Facility Name \& Type: Suburban P\&DC
Street Address: 16501 Shady Grove Road
Clty: Gaihhersburg
State: MD
5D Facility ZIP Code: 20898
District: Cepital
Area: Capital Metro
Finance Number: 23-8751
Current 3D Zlp Code(s): 208,209
EXFC office: Yes
Plant Manager: Darrell C Young
Senior Plant Manager: Darryl Martin
District Manager: Kelvin L Williams
----- PIR Data Entry Page

## 3. Background Information

Approval Date: January 27, 2010
Implementation Date: Jul-01-2010
PIR Type: Finel PIR
Date Range of Data: Jul-01-2010: Jun-30-2011
Processing Days per Year: 310
Bargaining Unit Hours per Year: 1,750
EAS Hours per Year: 1,825
Date of HQ memo, DAR Factors/Cost of Borrowing/ New Facility Start-up Costs Update
Date \& Time this workbook was last saved:

May 27, 2009
01-26-2012 11:17

## 4. Other Information

Area Vice President: David C. Fields
Vice President, Network Operations: David E. Williams
Area AMP Coordinator: Janet Hester
NAI Contact: Doris Billingslea

## Approval Signatures



 H2
$\qquad$


## Executive Summary

Last Saved: January 26, 2012

Date Range of Dats:

PIR Type: Final PIR
Jut-01-2010 - Jun-30-2011

| Losing Facility Name and Type: | Frederick P\&DF |
| :---: | :---: |
| Street Address: | 1550 Tilco Drive |
| City: | Frederick |
| State: | MD |
| Current SCF ZIP Code(s): | 217 |
| Type of Distribution Consolldated: | Originating |
| Gaining Facility Name and Type: | Suburban P\&DC |
| Street Address: | 16501 Shady Grove Road |
| City: | Gaithersburg |
| State: | MD |
| Current SCF ZIP Code(s): | 208,209 |

## Stmmaty of Monk heets

## Savings/Costs




# Summary Narrative <br> Last Saved: January 26, 2012 

## Losing Facility Name and Type: Frederick P\&DF Current SCF ZIP Code(s): <br> Type of Distribution Consolidated: Originating <br> Gaining Facility Name and Type: Suburban P\&DC <br> Current SCF ZIP Code(s): 208,209

## Background:

The Capital Metro Area, with the assistance from the Baltimore and Capital Performance Clusters, has completed the Final Post Implementation Review (PIR) of the Area Mail Processing (AMP) that consolidated originating mail from the Frederick, MD P\&DF to the Suburban, MD P\&DC. This Final PIR used data for the twelve months following implementation to determine if the Postal Service increased efficiency by consolidating originating mail processing operations from the Frederick, MD P\&DF to the Suburban, MD P\&DC. The AMP was approved March 1, 2010 and moved originating operations for the ZIP Code 217 to the Suburban, MD P\&DC without modifications to the operating plan. The transfer of volumes to the Suburban, MD P\&DC was completed on July 1, 2010.

The Frederick, MD P\&DF is an owned facility located approximately 28.7 miles from the Suburban, MD P\&DC.

Financial Summary:

| Final PIR vs | Final PIR vs |
| :---: | :---: |
| Pre AMP | Proposed |


| Total Annual Savings: | $\mathbf{\$ 6 , 3 1 9 , 6 6 3}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 5 , 1 3 6 , 3 2 1}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total First Year: | $\mathbf{\$ 6 , 2 2 6 , 6 6 3}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 5 , 1 3 6 , 3 2 1}$ |

The consolidation shifted an approximate average daily volume of 454,678 originating first handling mail pieces (Base Period) from the Frederick, MD P\&DF to the Suburban, MD P\&DC. There were numerous upgrades for all classes of mail and 4 downgrades for First-Class Mail. The Baltimore and Capital Districts in conjunction with the Capital Metro Area realigned transportation, improved operational efficiencies and made personnel scheduling adjustments to ensure service commitments were met.

## Customer Service Considerations:

The AMP proposal identified overnight service commitment improvements as noted in the evaluation. For Quarter 2 2010, pre-AMP implementation, the overnight percentage was $95.19 \%$ for Frederick MD and $90.55 \%$ for Suburban MD. For Quarter 22011 post-AMP implementation the overnight percentage was $95.85 \%$ for Frederick MD and $95.50 \%$ for Suburban MD. The Suburban, MD P\&DC EXFC First Class Mail Service Performance from TTMS for the AMP impacted ZIP Codes is shown below:

Frederick MD P\&DF

| Evice |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Fiscal Quarter | Overnight Percentage | 2 Day Percentage | 3 Day Percentage |
|  | Q3 2009 | 98.02\% | 94.88\% | 96.20\% |
| -etore Alıp | Q4 2009 | 97.19\% | 93.45\% | 94.21\% |
|  | Q1 2010 | 95.97\% | 90.20\% | 92.42\% |
|  | Q2 2010 | 95.19\% | 87.88\% | 87.85\% |
|  | Q3 2010 | 96.74\% | 94.87\% | 94.88\% |
| ter ATI | 042010 | 97.72\% | 91.65\% | 93,44\% |
| $\stackrel{+}{4}$ | Q12011 | 96.45\% | 87.18\% | 88.82\% |
|  | Q2 2011 | 95.85\% | 88.05\% | 8984\% |

Suburban MD P\&DC

|  |  | Wif ${ }^{\text {We }}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Fiscal Quarter | Ovemight Percentage | 2 Day Percentage | 3 Day Percentage |
| setore Alip | Q3 2009 | 96.96\% | 94.46\% | 96.16\% |
|  | Q4 2009 | 97.09\% | 96.37\% | 95.86\% |
|  | Q12010 | 96.41\% | 89.86\% | 90.59\% |
|  | Q2 2010 | 90.55\% | 87.12\% | 86.01\% |
| After A MiP | Q3 2010 | 97.44\% | 96.34\% | 94.71\% |
|  | Q4 2010 | 97.26\% | 94.62\% | 95.56\% |
|  | Q12011 | 97.27\% | 90.79\% | 90.94\% |
|  | Q2 2011 | 95.50\% | 89.27\% | 90.76\% |

The drop in customer scores is attributed to the customer satisfaction measurement system in FYO9 was CSM and in FY10, it changed to CEM. These two measurement systems have different parameters of measurement, therefore cannot be used for a comparison basis to each other.

## Transportation Changes:

The approved AMP projected an annual Transportation cost of $\$ 430,192$. The Final PIR projects costs of $\$ 81,363$ calculated from work-hour and HCR mileage changes.

## HCR 207PE

Transportation HCR 207PE was terminated and replaced with 207L8

## HCR 217XX

Transportation 217XX was not procured. This service was incorporated into 207L8

## Staffing Impacts:

Based upon the first two full quarters of data following AMP implementation, the annualized Function 1 work hour savings are $\$ 4,916,000$ compared to the initial AMP proposal of $\$ 1,130,421$ EAS work hour savings amount to $\$ 367,030$ compared to the proposed $\$ 88,321$. Craft personnel changes are summarized from the staffing comparison for complement as of the end of Quarter 1 FY 2011 versus Pre AMP.

The staffing impacts and management to craft ratios are summarized below.

| Management and Craft Staf fing Impacts |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Tounich rave |  |  |  |  |  | vo, 211 |
|  | Current OnRolls | Proposed | Diff | Current OnRolls | Proposed | Diff |  |
| Craft ${ }^{\text {²}}$ | 174 | 196 | 22 | 610 | 674 | 64 | 86 |
| Management | 12 | 14 | 2 | 37 | 41 | 4 | 6 |

[^0]

The USPS has not had to lay-off any employees from the Frederick, MD P\&DF to achieve current complement levels and has aggressively worked with the impacted employees for placement in career positions within the identified area of consideration in accordance with applicable collective bargaining agreements and Postal Service policies and regulations.

## Maintenance Impacts:

The AMP projected net annual maintenance savings of $\$ 330,993$ with the consolidation of originating operations into the Suburban P\&DC. The savings were attributed to the consolidation of cancellation operations at the Suburban P\&DC including the relocation of 1 AFCS with the associated support equipment from the Frederick P\&DF to the Suburban P\&DC. The Final PIR shows Maintenance annual savings of $\$ 295,152$ compared to the initial AMP proposal of \$330,993

The AMP study represented the consolidation of operations and the PIR reflects all current operational changes during the review period.

## Space Impacts and One Time Facility Costs:

The approved AMP projected a one-time cost associated with the AMP of $\$ 93,000$. The one-time costs were $\$ 93,000$ which is associated with the relocation of the AFCS and support equipment.

## Summary:

In conclusion the AMP proposal to move originating Frederick, MD P\&DF volume to the Suburban, MD P\&DC projected a first year savings of $\$ 1,090,342$. The Final Post implementation Review after implementation shows first years savings as $\$ 6,226,663$. Volume loss at Frederick, MD P\&DF and Suburban, MD P\&DC drove complement reductions through various efforts, such as early retirement incentives. Frederick, MD P\&DF reduced both craft and management staffing as proposed.

## Maintenance Staffing Analysis

The final PIR staffing analysis has been conducted for the Frederick P\&DF and Suburban P\&DC. The charts attached and below depict the current authorized staffing for both facilities. Maintenance work hour variances in the final PIR were primarily due to filling positions at the gaining facility that were previously withheld under Article 12 and additional OSHA mandated training. Additional maintenance costs were attributed to additional parts inventory for the new AFCS 200 machines

Maintenance Staffing Complement - Frederick P\&DF
Finance 23-3355

| LDC | Occ. Code | Title | Level | Current <br> Auth | New <br> Auth | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 37 | $530607 X X$ | BLDG EQUIP MECH | PS-09 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| 36 | $0856-0004$ | ELECTRONICS TECH | PS-10 | 9 | 7 | -2 |
| 36 | $534201 X X$ | MAINT MECH MPE | PS-09 | 7 | 6 | -1 |
| 36 | $474903 X X$ | MAINTENANCE MECH | PS-07 | 7 | 5 | -2 |
| 38 | $350203 X X$ | LABORER CUSTODIAL | PS-04 | 11 | 9 | -2 |
| 39 | $0303-01 X X$ | MAINT SUPPT CLERK | PS-06 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 39 | $0303-02 X X$ | MAINT SUPPT CLERK | PS-07 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
|  |  | TOtals |  | $\mathbf{3 8}$ | $\mathbf{3 1}$ | $\mathbf{- 7}$ |

Maintenance Staffing Complement - Suburban MD P\&DC Finance Number 23-8751

| LDC | Occ. Code | Title | Level | Current <br> Auth | New <br> Auth | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 36 | $0856-01 \times X$ | ELECTRONICS TECH | PS-10 | 20 | 20 | 0 |
| 36 | $5342-01 \times X$ | MAINT MECH MPE | PS-09 | 12 | 17 | +5 |
| 36 | $4749-03 X X$ | MAINTENANCE MECH | PS-07 | 18 | 18 | 0 |
| 37 | $4801-20 X X$ | AREA MAINT TECH | PS-09 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 37 | $5306-0002$ | BUILDING EQUIP. MECH | PS-09 | 5 | 5 | 0 |
| 37 | $3843-02 X X$ | LETTERBOX MECH | PS-08 | 1 | 0 | -1 |
| 38 | $3502-03 X X$ | LABORER CUSTODIAL | PS-04 | 22 | 21 | -1 |
| 39 | $0303-01 X X$ | MAINT SUPPT CLERK | PS-06 | 5 | 5 | 0 |
| 39 | $0303-02 X X$ | MAINT SUPPTCLERK | PS-07 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
|  |  | TOtal |  | 85 | $\mathbf{8 8}$ | +3 |

# Service Performance and Customer Satisfaction Measurement 

Last Saved: January 26, 2012
PIR Type: $\quad$ Final PIR
Implementation Date: $\quad \underline{07 / 01 / 10}$
Losing Facility: Frederick P\&DF
District: Baltimore

|  |  |  | - ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Fiscal Quarter | Overnight Percentage | 2 Day Percentage | 3 Day Percentage |  |  |  |
| Eetore AIIP | Q3 2009 | 98.02\% | 94.88\% | 96.20\% |  |  |  |
|  | Q4 2009 | 97.19\% | 83.45\% | 94.21\% |  |  |  |
|  | Q1 2010 | 95.97\% | 90.20\% | 82.42\% |  |  |  |
|  | Q2 2010 | 95.19\% | 87.88\% | 87.85\% | $\text { CEM* Q2 } 2011$ |  |  |
|  |  |  | SMer U0 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Question \# | Residential Top Two Box | Sm/Med Bus Top Two Box |
|  | Fiscal Quarter | Overnight Percentage | 2 Day Percentage | 3 Day <br> Percentage |  |  |  |
| After AMMP | Q3 2010 | 96.74\% | 94.67\% | 94.88\% | Q1 | 83.3\% | 80.1\% |
|  | Q4 2010 | 97.72\% | 91.65\% | 93.44\% | Q4a | 86.7\% | 85.1\% |
|  | Q1 2011 | 86.45\% | 87.18\% | 88.92\% | Q8a | 89.2\% | 89.9\% |
|  | Q2 2011 | 95.85\% | 88.05\% | 89.84\% | Q12a | 88.9\% | 85.3\% |
|  | +2\% |  |  |  | Q16a | 82.4\% | 78.5\% |
|  |  |  |  | W-3\% ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | Q19 | 59.2\% | 56.2\% |

Gaining Facility: Suburban P\&DC
District: Capital

(15) Notes $\qquad$

|  | $\text { CEM* Q2 } 2011$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Question \# | Residential Top Two Box | Sm/Med Bus Top Two Box |
| Q1 | 78.0\% | 74.4\% |
| Q4a | 82.7\% | 77.5\% |
| Q8a | 85.2\% | 82.8\% |
| Q12a | 64.9\% | 82.4\% |
| Q16a | 77.2\% | 73.3\% |
| Q19 | 48.2\% | 43.6\% |
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Losing Facility: Frederick P8.DF Gaining Facility: Sububan P\&DC

ate Range of Data:
Final PIR PIR Other Gaining Craft Workhours




|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\square$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| totals | 30.284 | 28.430 | 19.504 | - | 51,469,451 | \$1,381,130 | \$1,117.504 | Totals | 83,881 | 83.881 | 75,195 | \%er | \$4,372,723 | ${ }^{54,372,723}$ | \$4,165,936 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



Distribution to Other PIR Worksheet Tabs



|  |  |  | Sumatary by croup |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pratup Combined |  | Proposod.Combined |  | Finalfir - Combined |  | Special Adjustments |  | Final Plit to Proposad - Change |  |  |  | Finalpl to Pro-Alle. Chano |  |  |  |
|  | trantan: | Domen | Whorthome | Somin | moxtann | Dober | Wathoun | Ooten | mamacrave | Pracerctiond | Doterecheroo | Paremetcrave | Mmarachenot $P$ | Peocerecherem | Dosminctame | Percenctimat |
|  | 30.014 | 31,307,595 | 29200 | \$1.27.49: | 18,396 | \$847,215 | 。 | 50 | -10,833 | -37.10x | -5125,277 | -33.42x | -11,548 | -38.01\% | \$400370 | -35.214 |
|  | 14.4 .878 | 55,845,236 | 14.676 | 55, 84, 236 | 128.823 | \$5,506,575 |  | so | -15.854 | -10.80x | 5338,661 | -579x | . 15.054 | -10.96\% | 53388661 | 5.780 |
|  | 187732 | 88,445,33 | 194,563 | 58,296,777 | 186.733 | \$8,352, 19 |  | 50 | 1771 | $0.60 \times$ | 565.477 | $0.79 \times$ | -1,988 | -1.01x | \$93, 440 | -1.1 |
| Suppertaory pa | 114,184 | \$5,842,17 | 112311 | \$5753.853 | 94.069 | 55,283,442 |  | 50 | -17,912 | - $18.88 \times$ | \$470,411 | 8. 18 x | -19.460 | -17.05\% | 5558,732 | -9.56* |
| Supendisotcren dodmy | 5.542 | 5191,367 | 4.841 | \$182, 000 | 3.351 | 5120,032 |  | so | -1,288 | - $-27.78 \times$ | \$42, 2 \% | -28214 | -2.191 | .39.53x | -571,335 | -37.238 |
| Tox | 422.131 | 521,331,698 | 485,392 | 521.320 .956 | 440,974 | \$20,109,458 |  | 5 | 4417 | -9.158) | S1211,501 | 5.68 K | -51.156 | - $10.389 \times$ | -11.522,238 | $7.04 \times$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 44413 | 9.159 | $\stackrel{11,211,501}{ }$ | -5.68\% | 51,196 | -10.30x | -1,522,238 | 7.04 |



| Crmbinas Sxmmat |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Strix | 482.131 | \$21,631,698 |
| After | 485.392 | \$21,320,859 |
| Adi | 0 | \$0 |
| PR | 440,974 | \$20,109.458 |
| Ater | 485,392 | \$21,320,959 |
| avine | (6,739) | (\$310.737) |
| + 10 | -1.4\% | -1.48 |

# Staffing - Craft 

Last Saved: January 26, 2012
PIR Type: Final PIR

Losing Facility: Frederick P\&DF
Finance \#: 23-3355

| Craft Positions | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | 6 | (7) | (8) | (9) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Casual On-Rolls |  | Part Time On-Rolls |  | Full Time On-Rolls |  | Total On-Rolls |  |  |
|  | Pro AMp | Final PIR | Preamp | Final PIR | ProAMP | Final PIR | Pre AMP | Proposed | Final PIR |
| Function 1 - Clerk | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 113 | 97 | 114 | 99 | 97 |
| Function 4 - Clerk | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Function 1 - Mail Handler | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 45 | 47 | 49 | 45 | 48 |
| Function 4 - Mail Handler | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |
| Function 3A - Vehicle Service | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |
| Function 3B-Maintenance | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 26 | 32 | 29 | 28 |
| Functions 67-69-Limtd/RehabiWC |  |  | - 0 | 0 | - 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |
| Other Functions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |
| Total | - 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 4191 | 171 | 196 | 174 | 174 |
| Data Extraction Date: 07/15/11 |  |  |  |  |  |  | Variances Total On-Rolis |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Change Analysis | $\begin{aligned} & \text { (10) } \\ & \text { 1si PIR vs } \end{aligned}$ Pre AMP | (11) 1st PIR vs Proposed |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Positions | (22) | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Percent | .14\% | 0.08 |



Gaining Facility: Suburban P\&DC
Finance \#: 23-8751

| Craft Positions | (12) | (13) | (14) | (15) | (16) | (17) | (18) | (19) | (20) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Casual On-Rolls |  | Part Time On-Rolls |  | Full Time On-Rolls |  | Total On-Rolls |  |  |
|  | Pre AMP | Final PIR | Pre AMP | Final PIR | Pre AMP | Final PIR | Pre Amp | Proposed | Final PIR |
| Function 1-Clerk | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5 | 347 | 299 | 353 | 353 | 304 |
| Function 1-Mail Handler | 0 | 0 | -14 | 10 | 140 | 131 | 154 | 154 | 141 |
| Function $3 A$ - Vehicle Service | 0 | 0 | 12 | 11 | 67 | 62 | 79 | 79 | 73 |
| Function 3B-Maintenance | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 75 | 75 | 75 | 75 | 81 |
| Functions 67-69-LmddRehabuC | E | 3 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 8 | 9 | 9 | 8 |
| Other Functions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 |
| Total | 0 | 6 | 32 | 26 | 642 | 578 | 674 | 674 | 610 |
| Data Extraction Date: 07/15/11 |  |  |  |  |  |  | Variances Total On-Rolls |  |  |
| Total Craft Position Loss: | (23) <br> Final PIR vs Pre AMP |  | (24) <br> Final PIR vs Proposed |  |  |  | Change Analysis | (21) <br> Final PIR vs Pre AMP | (22) <br> Final PIR vs Proposed |
|  | 86 |  |  |  |  |  | Positions | 1641 | (6)1 |
|  | Above mimbers me camind forward to the $x$ xecutive Summary) |  |  |  |  |  | Percent | -9.5\% | -9.5\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | rev $415 / 10$ |  |

Staffing - PCES/EAS
Lasi Saved: fonuery 20, 2012
PIR Type: Fral PR



Transportation - PVS
Last Saved: January 26, 2012

|  | PIR Type: | Final PIR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Date Range of Data: | Jut01-2010 | - to - Jun-30-2011 |

Losing Facility: Frederick P\&DF Finance Number: 23-3355

|  | (1) <br> Pre AMP | (2) <br> Proposed | (3) <br> Final PIR | (4) Variance Final PIR vs Pre AMP | (5) Variance Final PIR ys Proposed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PVS Owned Equipment |  |  |  |  |  |
| Seven Ton Trucks | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Eleven Ton Trucks | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Single Axde Tractors | - 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Tandem Axle Tractors: | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Spotters | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| PVS Transportation |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of Schedules | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Total Annual Mieage | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Total Mileage Costs | 50 | 80 |  | \$0 | \$0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PVS Leases |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Vehicles Leased | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| Total Lease Costs | 50 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | 30 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PVs Workhour Costs |  |  |  |  |  |
| LDC 31 (617, 679, 764) | 50 | 50 | \$0 |  |  |
| LDC $34(765,766)$ | 50 | \$0 | 50 |  |  |
| Total Workhour Costs | 50 | \$0 | \$0 | $\$ 0$ | \$0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

(11) Total Final PIR vs Pre AMP Transportation-PVS Savings:
$(\$ 338,661)$
(This number added to the Executive Summary

Gaining Facllity: Suburban P\&DC
Finance Number: 23-8751

|  | (6) <br> Pre AMP | (7) <br> Proposed | (8) <br> PIR | (9) <br> Variance Final PIR vs Pre AMP | (10) Variance Final PIR vs Proposed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PVS Owned Equipment | - |  |  |  |  |
| Seven Ton Trucks | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Eleven Ton Trucks | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Single Axde Tractors | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Tandem Axde Tractors | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Spotters | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| PVS Transportation | - |  |  |  |  |
| Number of Schedules | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Total Annual Mileage | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Total Mileage Costs | 0 | \$0 |  | 50 | 50 |
|  | - |  |  |  |  |
| PVS Leases |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Vehicles Leased | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| Total Lease Costs | 50 | \$0 | \$0 | 50 | 30 |
|  | - |  |  |  |  |
| PVS Workhour Costs |  |  |  |  |  |
| LDC 31 (617, 679, 764) | 579,565 | \$79,565 | \$71,053 | (\$8,511) | ( 88,511 ) |
| LDC $34(765,766)$ | 55,765,671 | \$5,765,671 | \$5,435,521 | ( 3330,450 ) | ( 3330,450 ) |
| Total Workhour Costs | \$5,845,236 | \$5,845,236 | \$5,506,575 | [5330,664] | (3338,661) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

(12) Total Final PIR vs Proposed Transportation-PVS Savings:
( $\$ 338,661$ )
(This number added to the Executive Summary)
(13) Notes: $\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

Transportation - HCR
Last Saved: January 26, 2012
Losing Facility: Frederick P\&DF
PIR Type: Final PIR
Type of Distribution Consolidated: Originating
Data of HCR Data File: July 2010

| (1) Route \# | (2) <br> Pre AMP Annual Mileage | $\begin{gathered} \text { (3) } \\ \text { Proposed } \\ \text { Annual } \\ \text { Mileage } \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline(6) \\ \hline \text { Proposed } \\ \text { Annual } \\ \text { Cost } \end{gathered}$ | (7) <br> Final PIR Annual <br> cost | (8) <br> Pre AMP Annual costmile | (9) <br> Proposed Annual CostMile | (10) <br> Final PIR Annual Cost/Mile |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 207PE | 676,653 |  |  | \$952,915 |  |  | \$1.41 |  |  |
| 21017 | 642,867 |  |  | \$538,493 |  |  | \$0.84 |  |  |
| 207FE | 1,438,092 |  |  | \$1,587,006 |  |  | \$1.10 |  |  |
| 217XX | 0 |  |  | \$0 |  |  | \$0.00 |  |  |
| 21734 | 143,686 |  |  | \$202,424 |  |  | \$1.41 |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  | S0 |  |  |  |  | \#DIVIO! |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 50 |  |  |  |  | \#DIVIO! |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  | S0 |  |  |  |  | \#DIVIO! |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  | S0 |  |  |  |  | \#DIVI0! |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  | S0 |  |  |  |  | \#DIVI0! |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  | - $\$ 0$ |  |  |  |  | \#DIVI0! |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  | \$0 |  |  |  |  | \#DIVI0! |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  | - 50 |  |  |  |  | \#DIVI01 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  | \$0 |  |  |  |  | \#DIVI0! |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 50 |  |  |  |  | \#DIVIO! |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  | \$0 |  |  |  |  | \#DIVIO! |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  | \$0 |  |  |  |  | \#DIVI01 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  | So |  |  | - |  | \#DIVI0! |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  | \$0 |  |  |  |  | \#DIV/0! |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 50 |  |  |  |  | \#DIV/0! |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 50 |  |  |  |  | \#DIV/0! |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  | So |  |  |  |  | \#DIVfol |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  | \$0 |  |  |  |  | \#DIV/01 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  | \$0 |  |  |  |  | \#DIV/0! |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  | \$0 |  |  |  |  | \#DIVI0! |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  | So |  |  |  |  | \#DIV/0! |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  | \$0 |  |  |  |  | \#DIV/01 |
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| 0 | 0 | 0 |  | - 20 |  |  |  |  | \#DIV10! |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  | \$0 |  |  | - |  | \#DIVI0! |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  | - \$0 |  |  |  |  | \#DIV/01 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  | - 50 |  |  |  |  | \#DIV/0! |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  | \$0 |  |  |  |  | \#DIVIO! |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  | - $\$ 0$ |  |  | 25-4izem |  | \#DIV/01 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  | \$0 |  |  |  |  | \#DIVIO! |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  | \$0 |  |  |  |  | \#DIViol |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  | \$0 |  |  | 仡 |  | \#DIVI01 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  | \$0 |  |  |  |  | \#DIVI01 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  | S0 |  |  |  |  | \#DIV/01 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  | \$0 |  |  |  |  | \#DIVIOI |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  | - \$0 |  |  | -2 |  | \#DIV/0! |
| Totals | 2,901,298 | 3,034,831 | 2,738,753 | \$3,280,838 | \$3,519,518 | \$3,700,861 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Vari | ances Total Annual |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Change Analysis | (11) <br> Final PIR vs Pre AMP | (12) <br> Final PIR vs Proposed |  | - |  |
|  |  |  |  | Dollars | \$420,024 | \$181,343 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Percent | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |  |  |  |

## Transportation - HCR

Last Saved: January 26, 2012
Gaining Facility: Suburban P\&DC

Type of Distribution Consolidated: Originating Date of HCR Data File: July 2010

CET for Inbound Dock:
CET for Cancellations:

CET for OGP:
$\qquad$ CT for Outbound Dock: $\qquad$
(10)

| (8) <br> Pre AMP <br> Annual <br> Costmile | (9) <br> Proposed Annual Costimile | (10) <br> Final PIR Annual Cost/Mile |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - $\$ 0.00$ |  | \#DIV101 |
|  |  | \#DIVOI |
| - |  | \#DIV/01 |
| - |  | \#DIVI01 |
| - |  | \#DIVIO! |
|  |  | \#Diviol |
| 2erer |  | \#DIVI01 |
| - |  | \#DIVIOI |
|  |  | \#DIVIO |
| - |  | \#DNIOI |
| (2) |  | \#DIVIOI |
|  |  | \#DIVIor |
| - |  | \#DVion |
|  |  | \#DIVIOI |
|  |  | \#DIVIOI |
|  |  | \#DIV/01 |
|  |  | \#DIV/01 |
|  |  | \#DIV/01 |
|  |  | \#DNF01 |
|  |  | \#DIV/0! |
| - |  | \#DIVIO1 |
| , |  | \#Divol |
|  |  | \#Diviol |
|  |  | \#DIVIOI |
|  |  | \#DIVFO |
|  |  | \#DIV01 |
| (20 |  | \#DIV/01 |
|  |  | \#DIVIO1 |
|  |  | \#DIVIO |
|  |  | \#DIVIO1 |
| - |  | \#DIV/01 |
|  |  | \#DIV/01 |

PIR Transportation HCR - Gaining

| 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Totals | 0 | 111,651 | 0 |


| 30 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \$0 |  |  |
| \$0 |  |  |
| 42 |  |  |
| 80 |  |  |
| (4) 80 |  |  |
| 3) = \$0 |  |  |
| \$0 |  |  |
| \$0 | \$191.512 | \$0 |


| - ${ }^{\text {W }}$ |  | \#DIVIO: |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (\% |  | \#DIVIOI |
|  |  | HDIVIO: |
|  |  | \#DIV/0! |
| (2) ${ }^{\text {2 }}$ |  | \#DIVIOt |
|  |  | \#DIVF0: |
|  |  | \#DIVOI |
|  |  | \#DIV/01 |
|  |  |  |


| Variances Total Annual Costs |  |  | Summary HCR Losing \& Gaining |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Change Analyss | (11) <br> Final PtR vs Pre AMP | (12) <br> Final PIR vs Proposed |  | (13) <br> Finat PHR vs Pre AMP | (14) <br> Ftal PiR ws Proposed |
| Dotlars | \$0 | (\$191,512) | Losing | \$420,024 | \$181,343 |
| Percent | \#DIVIO! | .100.0\% | Gaining | 30 | (\$191.512) |

(13) Total Final PIR va Pre AMP Transportation-HCR Savings:
$\$ 420,024$ (from losing and gaining facitities)

## (14) Total FInal PIR ve Proposed Transportation-HCR Savings:

$(510,168)$ (from losing and gaining facilities)
$\left.\begin{array}{|c|c|c|}\hline & \text { Total Transportation }\end{array}\right]$
(15) Total Final PIR vs Pre AMP Transportation (PVS \& HCR): $\quad \$ 81,363$
(This number carried forward to the Executive Summary)
(16) Total Final PIR vs Proposed Transportation (PVS \& HCR):
( $\mathbf{\$ 3 4 8 , 8 3 0 )}$
(This number carried forward to the Executive Summary)

## MPE Inventory

Last Saved: January 26, 2012
Data Extraction Date: 07/15/11
PIR Type: Final PIR $\qquad$ - to - $\qquad$ Losing Facllity: Frederick P\&DF

| Equipment | (1) Pre AMP | (2) <br> Proposed | (3) <br> Final PIR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AFCS | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| AFSM-ALL | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| APPS | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| cioss | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| CSBCS | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DBCS | 9 | 9 | 9 |
| DBCS-OSS | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DIoss | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| FSS | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SBPS | 4 | 1 | 0 |
| UFSM | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| FC / MICRO MARK | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| ROBOT GANTRY | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| HSTS/HSUS | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| LCTS/LCUS | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| LIPS | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| MLOCR-ISS | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| MPBCSOSS | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TABBER | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| POWERED INDUSTRIAL VEHICLE | $0$ | 0 | 0 |
|  | We |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | - |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | 14 | 12 | 11 |

Gaining Facillty: Suburban P\&DC

| Equipment | (4) <br> Pre AMP | (5) <br> Proposed | (6) <br> Final PIR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AFCS | 4. 7 \% | 8 | 8 |
| AFSM-ALL | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| APPS | 0 \% | 0 | 0 |
| closs | 2. | 2 | 2 |
| csbcs | 0. | 0 | 0 |
| DBCS | 2 18 | 18 | 18 |
| DBCS-oss | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Dioss | 4. | 4 | 4 |
| FSS | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SBPS | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| UFSM | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| FC / MICRO MARK | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| ROBOT GANTRY | 5 0 | 0 | 0 |
| HSTS / HSUS | - 0 | 0 | 0 |
| LCTS / LCUS | \% 1 | 1 | 1 |
| LPS | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| MLOCR-15S | 0 \% | 0 | 0 |
| MPBCS-OSS | 0 \% | 0 | 0 |
| TABBER | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| POWERED NDUSTRIAL VEHICLE | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | - |  |  |
|  | , |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Totals | 37 | 38 | 38 |


| (7) <br> Proposed Relocation Costs | (8) <br> Final PIR <br> Relocation Costs | (9) <br> Variance in Costs |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \$93,000 | \$93,000 | \$0 |
| 50 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 80 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 80 | 30 | \%0 |
| \$0 | \$0 | \% 0 |
| \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 50 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 50 | \$0 | $\$ 0$ |
| 50 | \$0 | \% 0 |
| \$0 | \$0 | 80 |
| 80 | \$0 | \$0 |
| \$0 | 30 | \$0 |
| S0 | S0 | 50 |
| \$0 | 80 | \$0 |
| 30 | $\$ 0$ | \$0 |
| \$0 | \$0 | 30 |
| \$0 | \$0 | 50 |
| 50 | \$0 | \$9 |
| 80 | $\$ 0$ | 40 |
| \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| \$93,000 | \$93,000 | \$0 |

(10) Notes:

Equipment differences in Frederick from proposed vs PIR as a result of the approved Frederick destinating AMP.

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { Space Evaluation and } \\
\text { Other Costs }
\end{gathered}
$$

## Maintenance

Last Saved: January 26, 2012

(13) Notes: Manitenanco work hour variancos were primartity due to filing of positions previousty witheta under Aritide 12 and additional OSHA mandated training Mamienance Stockroom and Supplies wero impactod by the conversion of the kegacy AFCS mactimes to the now AFCS 200 model

## Distribution Changes

Last Saved: January 26, 2012
Losing Facility : Frederick P\&DF
PIR Type $\qquad$
Type of Distribution Consolidated: Originating
Date Range of Data $\qquad$ Jul-01-2010 - to - Jun-30-2011

Place a " $X$ " next to the DMM labeling list(s) revised as result of the approved AMP.

# Identify the date of the Postal Bulletin that contained DMM labeling list revisions. 

(2) $\square$

Was the Service Standard Directory updated for the approved AMP?
${ }^{(3)}$ Yes. July 1, 2010
(4) Drop Shipments for Destination Entry Discounts

FAST Appointment Summary Report

|  |  | NASS | Facility Name | Total | No-Show |  | Late Arrival |  | Open |  | Closed |  | Unschd Count |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Month | Losing / Gaining Facility | Code | Facility Name | Schd | Count | \% | Count | \% | Count | \% | Count | \% |  |
| May '10 | Losing Facility | 217 | Frederick P\&DF | 471 | 36 | 7.64\% | 176 | 37.37\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 435 | 92.36\% | 3 |
| Jun '10 | Losing Facility | 217 | Frederick P\&DF | 453 | 37 | 8.17\% | 182 | 40.18\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 416 | 91.83\% | 3 |
| May '10 | Gaining Facility | 200 | Suburban P\&DC | 736 | 122 | 16.58\% | 273 | 37.09\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 614 | 83.42\% | 17 |
| Jun '10 | Gaining Facility | 200 | Suburban P\&DC | 745 | 109 | 14.63\% | 288 | 38.66\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 636 | 85.37\% | 6 |

(5) Notes: $\qquad$

## Customer Service Issues

Last Saved: January 26, 2012
Losing Facllity: Frederick P\&DF
5-Dight ZIP Code: 21704
Data Extraction Date: 07/2014

1. Collection Points

Number picked up before 1 pm
Number picked up between $1.5 \mathrm{p} . \mathrm{m}$
Number picked up after 5 pm Total Number of Collection Points

| 3-Digit 2iP Code: 217 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pre AMP |  | PIR |  |
| Mon -Fit | Sat | Man. -Fri. | Sat. |
| 129 | 301 | 126 | 289 |
| 305 | 97 | 298 | 95 |
| 7 | 6 | 7 | 6 |
| 442 | 404 | 431 | 390 |
| designated for "local delivery"? |  |  | 0 |
| removed as a result of AMP? |  |  | 0 |
| Pre |  |  |  |
| Quaterfy | Fercent | Quanterfy | Percent |
| 032009 | 780\% | Q3 FY2010 | 593\% |
| 042009 | 800\% | Q4 FY2010 | 672\% |
| 012010 | 60.04 | Q1 FY2011 | 636\% |
| 62 2010 | 640\% | Q2 FY2011 | 678\% |

5. Retail Unit Inside Losing Facility (Window Service Times)

|  | Preamp |  | Proposed |  | Final PIR |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Star | End | Stant | End | Stant | End |
| Monday | NA | NA | NA | N/A | NA | N/ |
| Tuesday | NA | NA | NIA | Nu | N/A | N/A |
| Wodnesday | N/ | Na | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Thurscay | N/A | N/ | NA | N/A | NA | N/A |
| Fricay | N/4 | NA | N/A | N/ | N/A | N/ |
| Saturday | NA | NA | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |


7. Can custormern obtain a focal postmark in accordance with applionbte policies in the Postal Operatons Manual?
8. Notes:

Gaining Facility: Suburban P\&DC
9. What postmark is printed on collection mall?

## Space Evaluation and Other Costs

Last Saved: January 26, 2012



[^0]:    Craft $=\mathrm{FTR}+\mathrm{PTR}+\mathrm{PTF}+$ Casuals

